



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

both hurt and chastened him, and made him determined not to appear again before the public until he had something that would completely satisfy his own fastidious taste. His first volume had been cordially praised; his second met with a disappointing reception. To a modern reader, the poems of 1832 seem so enormously superior to those of 1830 that one is ready to censure the critics of that time. When one reads those two little books of verses in their original editions, however, one feels more sympathy with the critics. Tennyson did not revise, he really rewrote in subsequent years the poems of 1832, as Churton Collins pointed out, and as any one may see for himself.

I own a volume that perhaps helps to explain Tennyson's obstinate silence. It is today a rare book, and I have never seen any allusion to it in critical works on Tennyson. It bears the detestable title, *The Book of Gems*. It appeared in London in 1838, and was edited by S. C. Hall, who had during the two preceding years published two volumes with the same title, which, however, did not, like the 1838 volume, deal with contemporary poets. This book contains 304 pages, and is made up of extracts from the works of forty modern British poets, with biographical and critical comments on each. Hall was not a bad critic; he praised Keats in the highest terms, both as a man and as a poet. But for our purpose the most interesting page in the volume is that devoted to Alfred Tennyson. After a biographical account, Hall wrote this significant paragraph:

"Mr. Tennyson has published two volumes; and the last is not the best. Our extracts are, with but one exception, made from the former. It is to be regretted that the reputation which this work obtained for him did not induce him to write with a higher object than that of amusing and gratifying the reader, by a collection of brief and comparatively unimportant poems, or that until he had succeeded in producing something more worthy of his genius, he did not abstain from appearing a second time before the public. The world will look with anxiety to the next; it will decide the point which is still undecided—whether another great Poet is to be added to the long list which the present

century has supplied to us, or whether the industry and energy of the author of 'Poems, chiefly Lyrical,' are not equal to his delicacy and imagination. His compositions are, undoubtedly, brilliant and beautiful: their merit is sufficient to justify the praise he has received; and it is only because he has afforded ample proof of his capacity to do better, that we lament he has not yet fulfilled the earliest promise of his genius."

I cannot help thinking that Hall's remarks aided in delaying Tennyson's next publication, and thus help to explain his long silence. It is pleasant to remember that the two volumes of 1842 did settle once for all the question raised by Hall; pleasant also to note that Hall lived until the year 1889, and had abundant opportunity to realize the consummation of his anxious hopes for the young poet.

WM. LYON PHELPS.

Yale University.

#### A SYNTACTICAL NOTE

*To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.*

SIRS:—In "*Das Eng. Relativ im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert*" Dr. Anklam says (p. 9), "Doch fehlt wohl ein Relativ in Ancren Riwele, þus he spekeð to Moyses, þet monne mest him luvede, 408.20, das Morton wiedergibt durch: Thus he speaketh to Moses, the man who loved him most." In *Critical Contributions to Early English Syntax* (2d Series, p. 10) Dr. Bödtker says, "Among the examples from early MidE. texts quoted by Anklam, l. c. p. 9, there is really only one that marks a step forward [in the change from parataxis to hypotaxis]," quoting this example. A right understanding of this sentence will show, I think, that it contributes nothing to the history of the relative. Both Anklam and Bödtker are apparently misled by Morton's mistranslation, for *monne* is here a genitive plural, and *þet* is the ordinary relative: "Moses, who of men loved him most." The weak form (O. E. *manna*) is rare in the nominative singular even in O. E. Mätzner and the Oxford record no M. E. in-

stances. The usual form in the *A. R.* is nom. *mon*, with gen. pl. *monne* (cf. ine *monne* *eihsihøe*, *Sprachpr.* p. 13). Moreover, the genitive plural with *mest* (adj. and adv.) and with other words is a common idiom: *S. Eng. Leg.* Ich habbe i-sunegut manne mest (*NED*, s. v. *man*); *Orm.* & gho patt cwemmde himm allre mæst Off all mannkinn (*NED*, *most*, adv.); gho wass wiss allre manne mast Off sofasst lufe filledd (Mtz. s. v. *man*); *Laḡ.* Wilcume læuerd, monne me leofest (ib.),—cf. wummen me leouest, *A. R.* (*Sprachpr.* p. 40). Exactly parallel in sense to our passage is *Laḡ.* For he of alle monnen mæst hine lufede (Mtz. s. v. *mare*); where the analytic form replaces the inflected genitive. Numerous other parallels may be seen in Mätzner's *Wb.*

JOHN S. KENYON.

Butler College.

#### BRIEF MENTION

Martinon's *Comment on prononce le français* (Larousse, 1913, xi + 414 pp.) is a treatise, addressed to natives, in which the author disclaims any attempt at scientific treatment or arrangement, stating that he is simply setting down, in the way which should render his material most easily accessible to the layman, the pronunciation of French words in accordance with cultivated Parisian usage, save in cases where such usage is purely local. It would be highly desirable to have a statement of how Mr. Martinon arrives at the determination of this delicate and complicated problem, particularly as he constantly and very emphatically contradicts the three works he chooses as his standard of comparison—the *Dictionnaire général*, Rousselot's *Précis*, and the *Michaëlis-Passy*. In the absence of all indication, we are justified only in assuming that the rules given indicate the way one intelligent and manifestly observant Frenchman believes that his mother tongue is pronounced by himself and the average cultivated person with whom he is thrown. Taken at this valuation, the book is of decided interest and utility even to the foreign audience whose ear he is not asking. They, and his chosen public as well, would profit, however, by the introduction of certain modifications. Let the author start from the written symbols if he will, but his treatment would be much more systematic and much more compact should

he abandon his attempt to follow the alphabetic order for vowels and consonants. Only gain would result from the omission of such statements as that, when an open *a* is changed to a close *a* by moving the palm of the hand toward the mouth, "la main fait ici l'office du *gosier*" (p. 5); or that the 'mute' consonants are so named "parce qu'elles ne se font sentir réellement qu'avec l'aide d'une voyelle" (p. 7). Certain etymologies sown by the wayside had better be excluded, such as the identification of *ménager* with Eng. *manager* (p. 66). Further, what is the use of introducing historical explanations into a book of this declared aim and type? Above all, since some of the specimens offered are not edifying; witness the explanation of *bien* as having originally been pronounced *bian* (p. 136); or of an original pronunciation *eune* for *un* (p. 280); or of the *s* in *volontiers* as having been introduced as a sign of the plural (pp. 293, 295).

While Spielhagen's reputation as novelist is not what it was a generation ago, his literary and historical importance are great enough to make welcome a school-edition, by M. M. Skinner, of his *Novelle Das Skelett im Hause* (D. C. Heath & Co.). To bring it within the compass demanded by schools, the story has been abridged rather more than a fourth. This has been done, not by cutting out episodes, but by omitting bits of dialogue and description wherever the opportunity offered. In the main this pruning has been done very skilfully, but any such process always involves the dangers of eliminating connecting links in the narrative, a danger that the editor has not altogether succeeded in escaping. Thus there is no longer any motivation for *sprang mit einem Satze in die Höhe* (p. 4, l. 12), which in the original found its explanation in *es duftete im ganzen Hause nach frischgebranntem Kaffee*; and *auf Arthurs Seite* (p. 8, l. 13) no longer clearly refers to the suit for the heroine's hand. One is sorry also to see the vivid picture of the North German landscape dulled somewhat and to have the lines of Frau Ülzen, the most convincing character sketch of the story, cut down. The notes have been prepared with care. A serious slip is the dating of Wolfram von Eschenbach on p. 140. While the fable is rather slight, the suspense as to the denouement is kept up till the very end. The thoroughly German atmosphere also will commend the book to our schools.